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Goals

• Study of personal networks of individuals across various countries in relation with welfare state policies
• Study of norms of family solidarity in various countries in relation with state social policies
• Comparison of personal networks and norms of support according to welfare State policies
Theoretical model

The interactions between strategies of family reproduction and state social policy

Strategies of family reproduction

Social network and norms

State social policy
Selected countries

• Dataset includes individuals from 4 groups of countries (according to Esping Andersen typology)

• The following types of countries considered:
  ➢ **Conservative:** France, Germany, Spain
  ➢ **Liberal:** United States, Canada, Great Britain and Switzerland
  ➢ **Social-democratic:** Finland, Denmark and Norway
  ➢ **Russia**
## Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conservative countries</th>
<th>Liberal countries</th>
<th>Social-democratic countries</th>
<th>Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family oriented contacts and visits</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family oriented norms of support</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

++ High positive correlation
+++ Medium correlation
--- High negative correlation
Dataset

Dataset International Social Survey Program (ISSP 2001)

Social Networks and Social Relations

14450 individuals were selected from 4 types of welfare regime countries:

- Conservative 3981 individuals
- Liberal 4177 individuals
- Social-democratic 4292 individuals
- Russia 2000 individuals

Selection of individuals:

Individuals whose mother/father, son/daughter or sibling are alive. There are 61 missing data for social network.
## Types of personal networks according to welfare state regimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster type, Frequency of contacts with... (%)</th>
<th>Children (34.3%)</th>
<th>Parents, sibling, uncle, aunt (34.0%)</th>
<th>Associations clubs, sport groups, political parties (21.3%)</th>
<th>Absence of contacts (10.4%)</th>
<th>Total (100.0%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative countries</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal countries</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-democratic countries</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network types according to Welfare state types. Scores of Correspondence analysis
### Types of normative support according to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster type</th>
<th>Norms of support, (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family and friend support (12,1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative countries</td>
<td>10,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal countries</td>
<td>22,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-democratic countries</td>
<td>4,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>10,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Normative support according to type of welfare state. Scores of Correspondence analysis.
Conclusion: personal networks

• **Conservative**: the family oriented contacts are preferred

• **Liberal**: family and non family contacts are preferred with equal footing. Family contacts are biased towards children.

• **Social-democratic**: family and non family contacts are preferred with equal footing. Family contacts are biased towards parents.

• **Russia**: the family oriented contacts are preferred

The results confirm our hypotheses
Conclusion: norms of support

- **Conservative countries**: dominant State and interplay between State and family norms of support
- **Liberal countries**: Normative non-support. However family and friend supports remain significant for a minority of individuals.
- **Social-democratic**: the highest State support among considered group of countries
- **Russia**: strictly dominant interplay of all support norms: family, friend and State.

The results partly confirm our hypotheses
## Summary results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conservative countries</th>
<th>Liberal countries</th>
<th>Social-democratic countries</th>
<th>Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family oriented contacts and visits</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family oriented norms of support</td>
<td>(+-)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(+-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

++ High positive correlation
+---medium correlation
--- High negative correlation
To do ..... 

Add other countries 

Consider individual characteristics of respondents: 
  • age 
  • sex 
  • profession 
  • level of education 
  • marital status
Back up
Measures of contacts

Directs contacts (visits)
1. The visits of an individual with close relatives (parents, children, sibling)
2. The visits of an individual with other relatives (uncle, aunt, cousins, sibling-in-law, niece, nephew, parents-in-law, godparents)
   • The frequency of visits (1-7)

Other contacts (by telephone, internet)
• The frequency of other contacts (1-4)
Measures of norms of support

The norms of support for elderly parents, family, and friends

• strongly agree/strongly disagree (1-5)

The norms of government’s responsibility to provide a childcare, for the elderly persons

• definitely should be/definitely should not be (1-4)